



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/670,295	09/26/2000	Yuan-Chi Chang	YOR9-2000-0460US1	3349

7590 06/21/2005
Wayne L Ellenbogen
Ryan, Mason & Lewis llp
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER

ZAND, KAMBIZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/670,295

Applicant(s)

CHANG ET AL.

Examiner

Kambiz Zand

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. enclosed.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this section can be found in the prior office action.
2. The prior office actions are incorporated herein by reference. In particular, the observations with respect to claim language, and response to previously presented arguments.
3. Claims 1 and 26 have been amended.
4. New claim 28 has been added.
5. Claims 1-28 are pending.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 filed 04/01/2005 have been fully considered and they are persuasive.
7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the **new claim 28** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. **Claim 28** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 2-5,7-9,12-15 and 17-20, the “couplable”, “configurable” phrases makes the claims indefinite and unclear in that neither means nor interrelationship of means are set forth in these claims in order to achieve the desired results expressed in the “couplable”, “configurable” phrases.

It is not clear if the transcoding proxy is connected to the content provider or not; and if the transcoding proxy transmitting any modified encrypted component to a client device. Examiner considers these phrases in broadest possible term addressing the limitations of the claim as such connections not exist. Examiner further suggest the phrase to be changed to “connecting” and deleting the phrase “is configurable for” from the claim language respectively in order to bring a positive connectivity between essential devices involved in the claim 28 in order to have a harmony with method claim 1; and system claim 26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. **Claim 28** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knauerhase et al (6345303 B1) in view of Hild et al (6763460 B1)..

Art Unit: 2132

With respect to Claim 1, Knauerhase meets the limitation of the generating a plurality of data components at the content provider, the components being a decomposition of the data" on column 3, lines 27-32,. and encrypting each of the data components" on column 8, lines 1 1-16., lines 52-58,. and the transmitting the manipulated transcoded data components generated by the transcoding proxy to the client device" is met on column 3, lines 39-43. The limitation of generating a plurality of data components is inherently met by the parser in the reference. column 3, lines 55-58. disclose multimedia data.

Knauerhase however does not meet the following limitation; wherein the steps of transcoding and manipulating the encrypted data components are performed without a need for first decrypting the encrypted data components.

Hild et al meets the limitation of; wherein the steps of transcoding and manipulating the encrypted data components are performed without a need for first decrypting the encrypted data components" on column 3, lines 19-24.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hild et al within the system of Knauerhase because transcoding of the encrypted data would keep the data being transmitted secure. This is important for security sensitive data transfers as seen in Hild et al (column 2, lines 47-51).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. **Claim 28** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dutta et al (6,615,212 B1).

As per claim 28 Dutta et al (6,615,212 B1) disclose the generating a plurality of data components at the content provider, the components being a decomposition of the data and encrypting each of the data components, and the transmitting the manipulated transcoded data components generated by the transcoding proxy to the client device. The limitation of generating a plurality of data components, multimedia data wherein the steps of transcoding and manipulating the encrypted data components are performed without a need for first decrypting the encrypted data components (see abstract; fig.4 and associated text where the content provider is the servers and other devices can act as clients; fig.5-6 and associated text).

12. **Claim 28** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eibott et al (6,553,393 B1).

As per claim 28 Eibott et al (6,553,393 B1) disclose the generating a plurality of data components at the content provider, the components being a decomposition of the data and encrypting each of the data components, and the transmitting the manipulated transcoded data components generated by the transcoding proxy to the client device. The limitation of generating a plurality of data components, multimedia data wherein the steps of transcoding and manipulating the encrypted

Art Unit: 2132

data components are performed without a need for first decrypting the encrypted data components (see abstract; fig.2 and 5 and associated text).

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Claims 1-27 are allowed.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kambiz Zand whose telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 2132

272-3811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kambiz Zand

06/16/2005

AU 2132